

cavity of which is directed inwards; the other has a very elegant transverse section (fig. 1). It is shaped like a dumb-bell, one head of which rests within the concavity of the crescentic bundle, and the other turns in the opposite direction; at each of these two extremities the margin of the dumb-bell is excavated into a small bay, as if a vertical canal had existed at each point; but these seem to have been merely columns of cellular tissue encroaching upon the rounded outline of the vascular structures. I propose provisionally to recognize these two forms under the generic name of *Arpexylon*.



Fig. 1. *Arpexylon duplex*. Fig. 2. *Arpexylon simplex*. Fig. 3. *Edraxylon*.

Fig. 3 represents a stem or petiole in which the section of the vascular bundle presents the form of a chair or seat, and to which I propose to assign the name *Edraxylon*. This form exhibits numerous modifications of the pattern represented in the outline, down to a single central vascular bundle. It may prove to belong to *Dictyoxyton Oldhamium*.

MISCELLANEOUS.

On the Specific Name of the Black Redstart.

By ALFRED NEWTON, M.A., F.R.S.

DR. GRAY'S note "On the name *Tethya* and its Varieties of Spelling" in the last Number of the 'Annals' (p. 150) reminds me of a still greater diversity which has long existed among ornithologists as to the spelling of a name which at first sight looks as if it might have something in common with that of *Tethya*.

In 1769 Scopoli (*Annus I. Historico-naturalis*, p. 157) characterized a now well-known bird as "*Sylvia tithys*," with a reference to "*Linn. S. N. XI. n. 23.*" The eleventh edition of Linnæus's great work is not at present accessible to me; but it was notoriously a mere reprint of his tenth edition (1758), of which a copy is now before me. Here (i. p. 187) we have the 23rd species of the genus *Motacilla* designated "*Titys*," and a reference to "*Fn. svec. 227*;" but this, as Linnæus in his twelfth edition (i. p. 335) allowed, was the female of his *M. phœnicurus*, and Scopoli was unconsciously the first to give a binomial title to the species we now know as the Black Redstart; in so doing, however, he misspelt the word, introducing an *h* into the name, and in consequence opened a door for a great number of future errors, while puzzling naturalists to account for it.

Linnæus, in his mode of spelling, copied Gesner, who in 1555 (*Hist. Anim. iii. p. 719*) has *titys*; but the latter also mentions that

Dionysius writes *titis*; and this seems to be the correct form of the word. Turning to Liddell and Scott's 'Lexicon,' based on that of Passow, we have:—

“*τίτις*, ἴδος, ἡ, like *πιπῶ*, a small chirping bird, Phot.”

Now Photius flourished somewhere about A.D. 850; and looking to his dictionary, printed in 1822 from the Gale MS., and edited by Porson and Bekker, we see (ii. p. 592):—

“*τίτις*: βραχὺ ὀρνίθιον σημαίνει καὶ τὸ γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον τῖτις καὶ ἡ κέρκος.”

Stephanus also shows that *titis* is the correct form. In his 'The-saurus' (ed. Paris: 1848–1854, vii. p. 2241) we have “*τίτις*, ἴδος, ἡ, *avicula*,” &c., and the sentence “ἐμβιβάζεσθαι εἰς τὰς καλουμένας *τιτίδας*,” which settles the matter. Moreover he adds “*τίτυς* in vv. LL. affertur pro *τίτις*.”

Photius and others after him derive the word *τίτις* from *τιτίζειν*, otherwise written *πιτίζειν*, to chirp.

Hence we may conclude that *titis* was originally a general name for a small chirping bird, that in time it became specially applied to some bird with a red tail, that as such it had one or more figurative meanings (in the sentence above quoted we might perhaps translate it by “Firetail”), concerning which we need not now trouble ourselves, and that *tityς* is an erroneous form, which has been still further corrupted into *tithys*, *tethys*, *thytis*, and I know not how many other misspellings.

Lastly, I may perhaps venture to hint that the root of *titis* exists in the prefix “Tit” of the English “Titlark” and “Titmouse,” and the first syllable of the Icelandic *Títlingur*, where it retains its primitive generalized meaning.

In excuse for occupying all this space, I may mention that naturalists like Hemprich and Ehrenberg (Symb. Phys. fol. *bb*) and Von Heuglin (Orn. Nordost-Afr. i. p. 334) have not thought it beneath them to attempt an explanation of this word, referring it to *τίτης*, *ultor*, with which it has nothing whatever to do.

3 August, 1872.

New Names for a long-known Lepidopteron. By C. RITSEMA.

In the last Number of the 'Annals,' Mr. A. G. Butler describes and represents a new genus and species of the family Notodontidæ. The genus is named *Tarsolepis*, the species *T. remicauda*.

The same insect, however, was figured as far back as 1806 by J. Hübner, in the second volume (plate 197) of his 'Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge,' under the name of *Crino Sommeri*, and as belonging to the Noctuæ genuinæ. Herrich-Schäffer (Sammlung neuer oder wenig bekannter ausser-europäischer Schmetterlinge, p. 11) changed the generic name as used before into *Crinodes*, and placed the insect in the family Notodontina. Walker, on the other hand, in his 'List of the Specimens of Lepidopterous Insects in the Collection of the British Museum,' part xiv. (1858), p. 1346, places the genus